

REMARKS

This response is submitted with a Request for Continued Examination for consideration with the Amendment filed June 9, 2009. In the June 9 Amendment, independent claims 8 and 28 were amended to recite:

a pneumatic actuator operatively coupled to said piston and being selectively movable from a first position wherein said piston rod engages said valve such that said valve is in said open position, to a second position wherein said piston rod is not engaged with said valve.

Claim 27 was amended to recite "actuating a piston . . . to move a valve . . . from a closed position to an open position." Applicants asserted that the references of record:

fail to disclose a pneumatic actuator operatively coupled to a piston and being movable from a first position to a second position to place a valve in an open position, as set forth in claims 8 and 28, or actuating a piston between a first position and second position to move a valve from a closed position to an open position, as set forth in claim 27.
(Amendment filed June 9, 2009, pp. 13-14.)

In response to the Amendment, the Examiner stated that:

it is not seen how the bias adjustment mechanism prevents the normal pressure regulator action of the references.
(Advisory Action mailed June 23, 2009, Continuation Sheet.)

The Examiner seems to have misunderstood Applicant's remarks. Applicant respectfully points out that the argument presented in the June 9 Amendment was not that the bias adjustment mechanisms of the cited references prevent normal pressure regulator action, but simply that the references fail to teach or suggest a pneumatic actuator to move the respective valves to an open position, as set forth in claims 8 and

28, or a method including actuating a piston from a first position to a second position to move a valve from a closed position to an open position, as set forth in claim 27.

Instead, the references of record are conventional pressure regulators that rely upon the action of the biasing mechanism (e.g., springs) to effect opening and closing of the valves. No pneumatic actuators are disclosed in the references. Because the cited references fail to teach or suggest the claimed structure and methods, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections of claims 8, 27, and 28 be withdrawn, as discussed in the June 9 Amendment.

Conclusion

For the reasons set forth in the Amendment filed June 9, 2009, and in view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant believes this application is in condition for allowance and respectfully requests allowance of the pending claims. If the Examiner believes any issue requires further discussion, the Examiner is respectfully asked to telephone the undersigned attorney so that the matter may be promptly resolved. The Examiner's prompt attention to this matter is appreciated.

Applicant does not believe that any fee is due in connection with this submission, other than \$810 for filing a Request for Continued Examination. However, if any additional fees are necessary to complete this communication, the Commissioner may consider this to be a request for such and charge any such fees to Deposit Account No. 23-3000.

Application Serial No. 10/564,463
Reply to Advisory Action dated June 23, 2009
Amendment dated July 10, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

WOOD, HERRON & EVANS, L.L.P.

/David W. Dorton/

David W. Dorton

Reg. No. 51,625

2700 Carew Tower
441 Vine Street
Cincinnati, OH 45202
(513) 241-2324 (voice)
(513) 421-7269 (facsimile)